

**REMARKS**

Claims 1, 5, and 9 have been amended. Claims 2, 6 and 10-12 have been canceled solely to further the prosecution of the application. Claims 1, 3-5 and 7-9 remain pending in this Application. Applicants reserve the right to pursue the original claims and other claims in this and in other applications.

The Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action mailed on March 10, 2005. Reconsideration of all outstanding rejections and objections in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks is respectfully requested.

The Specification has been amended to correct obvious typographic errors. No new matter has been added.

FIG. 5 has been amended to correct draftsman oversight and to include element 24. Support for this amendment can be found at paragraph [0038]. No new matter has been added. For the Examiner's convenience, a marked-up version showing the changes to FIG. 5 is also attached hereto.

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Kainulainen et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,262,996) ("Kainulainen"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Kainulainen discloses "a network arrangement and a method for connecting a message-based system (using message-based synchronization) with an external system by converting the synchronization status received from the external system into the internal synchronization status of the message-based system in an interface node of the message-based system in such a manner that the level in the internal synchronization hierarchy of the message-based system (as indicated by the internal synchronization status) rises or falls corresponding to a corresponding rise or fall of a

predetermined magnitude occurring in the synchronization status of the external system.” (Kainulainen, abstract)

Claim 1 recites a terminal devices synchronizing method for synchronizing a plurality of terminal devices interconnected through a network where “the respective terminal devices compris[e] vertical synchronizing signal generating means for generating vertical synchronizing signals, and control means for making synchronization control operations and data communication, based on the vertical synchronizing signals, respectively.” According to claim 1, “the respective terminal devices extract the synchronizing signals from either of broadcasting signals, time reference signals and an a.c. power source inputted from the outside other than the respective terminal devices, the vertical synchronizing signals generating means of the respective terminal devices output the synchronizing signals as vertical synchronizing signals when the synchronizing signals are extracted, but outputting back-up vertical synchronizing signals when the synchronizing signals are not extracted.” In addition, “the control means of the respective terminal devices make synchronization control operations and data communication based on the vertical synchronizing signals or the back-up vertical synchronizing signals.”

Kainulainen fails to disclose or suggest the claimed invention. Specifically, there is nothing in the cited reference that discloses or suggests: (a) synchronizing signals that are extracted from either broadcasting signals, time reference signals and an a.c. power source inputted from the outside other than the respective terminal devices, and the respective terminal devices make synchronization control operation and data communication, based on the extracted synchronizing signals; and (b) the respective terminal devices output the synchronizing signals as vertical synchronizing signals when the synchronizing signals are not extracted, and the respective terminal devices make synchronization control operations and data communication, based on

the vertical synchronizing signals or the back-up vertical synchronizing signals.  
Therefore, for at least these reasons the rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn.

Claims 3-4 depend from claim 1 and are allowable for at least that reason.  
Therefore the rejection of these claims should be withdrawn.

Claims 5 and 9 have a similar limitation as claim 1 and are allowable for at least the reasons set forth above and on their own merits. Therefore the rejection of claims 5 and 9 should be withdrawn.

Claims 7-8 depend from claim 5 and are allowable for at least the reasons set forth above and on their own merits. Therefore the rejection of these claims should be withdrawn.

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: July 7, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Thomas J. D'Amico

Registration No.: 28,371

Michael A. Weinstein

Registration No.: 53,754

DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN &  
OSHINSKY LLP

2101 L Street NW

Washington, DC 20037-1526

(202) 785-9700

Attorneys for Applicant

**AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS**

The attached replacement drawing sheet includes changes to FIG. 5.

Attachments: Replacement sheet  
Annotated sheet showing changes

ANNOTATED SHEET SHOWING CHANGES

FIG. 5

